



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/237,827	01/27/1999	JOHN S. HENDRICKS	026880.00013	7009
4372 7590 01/12/2007 ARENT FOX PLLC 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER SALCE, JASON P	
			ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	
3 MONTHS			01/12/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/237,827

Applicant(s)

HENDRICKS ET AL.

Examiner

Jason P. Salce

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 and 63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 and 63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/28/2006.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/30/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner notes that the references used in the previous Office Action still read on the prior art of record (see the updated rejection below).

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 9/28/2006 regarding all U.S. Patent and Patent Application Publications was filed after the mailing date of the Final Rejection on 06/26/2006. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner has considered the information disclosure statement.

3. The information disclosure statement filed 09/28/2006 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because for all foreign applications and published articles (NPL documents) a copy has not been provided to the examiner. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the

Art Unit: 2623

statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e).

See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-13, 18-19, 22-24, 26-29 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,093,718 to Hoarty et al. in view of Kubota (U.S. Patent No. 5,506,902) in further view of Redford et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,624,265).

Regarding Claim 1, Hoarty discloses a system for transmitting and receiving text (Col. 6, Lines 36-39) and displaying an indication of the text (Col. 11, Lines 11-23), wherein the text is transmitting in an electronic signal (Col. 8, Lines 18-54), the system comprising a processor (See Figure 2, head-end computer 8) that produces an electronic signal containing a representation of the textual data as stated above, a transmitter connected to the processor (Col. 8, Lines 30-34) and a connector (home interface controller, See Figure 1, 16 and Col. 5, Lines 24-30) that receives the electronic signal (Col. 5, Lines 31-34 and Col. 8, Lines 7-9). Further disclosed is a TV (See Figure 3, 38). This reads on the claimed display, connected to the connector

Art Unit: 2623

(home interface controller) that displays a particular library menu (Col. 13, Lines 17-20) relating to the textual data and based upon a subscriber-entered selection (Col. 11, Lines 11-23).

Hoarty also discloses means, connected to the connector (see remote controls 40 and 56 and remote control infrared transceiver 78), for selecting a portion of the textual data (see Column 9, Lines 7-10 and Column 10, Lines 34-39 and Column 11, Lines 11-15 and Lines 42-46), comprising means for receiving a subscriber entry indicating a title of the textual data (see Column 12, Lines 28-35 for showing the user titles of programs to select and by the use of the remote control, select a channel (see Column 15, Lines 5-6)), wherein the title correlates to a portion of the textual data (note that the channel selected inherently correlates to a portion of the textual data (the title displayed in the program guide)).

Hoarty fails to teach offering the interactive service of electronic books that can be selected in an interactive guide.

Kubota discloses a library (see recorder 7 in Figure 14) that stores an electronic collection of electronic books (see Column 9, Lines 15-28) and a menu generator that determines whether to generate a menu of the books located in the collection based on a subscriber's entry and a default menu (see Column 9, Lines 1-9 and Column 10, Lines 1-9 for instructing the system to display an initial page which displays a list of potential books, where the list is displayed first and therefore the user must select the list from a previously displayed page).

Art Unit: 2623

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the electronic book system, as taught by Redford, using the electronic book system with menu generation, as taught by Kubota, for the purpose of presenting substantially no inconvenience in displaying only a selected article (see Column 10, Lines 8-9 of Kubota).

Although Kubota teaches that electronic books can be transmitted electronically, as well as Hoarty and Kubota both teaching a home subsystem (see Figure 8 of Hoarty and Figure 1 of Kubota), Hoarty and Kubota fail to teach that the electronic books can be ordered and transmitted electronically via a transmitter.

Redford discloses ordering and transmitting electronic books via transmitter (see Column 15, Lines 39-50), wherein in response to a transmitted order, the ordered electronic book is transmitted from a remote operations center to the home subsystem and stored in the library unit of the home subsystem until a selection is received to view the electronic book (see Figures 1E and 4A-4B and Column 13, Line 34 through Column 14, Line 9 and Column 18, Line 57 through Column 21, Line 57).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the electronic book system, as taught by Hoarty and Kubota, using the ordering process, as taught by Redford, for the purpose of utilizing remote storage devices that are capable of storing a greater amount of electronic book content (see Figure 1E for multiple remote storage devices 132A-132D).

Art Unit: 2623

Regarding Claim 2, Hoarty discloses a system as stated above in Claim 1, wherein the processor produces the electronic signal as a video formatted composite signal (Col. 8, Lines 30-46).

Regarding Claim 7, Kubota discloses a default menu (see Figure 12(a)).

Regarding Claim 8, Hoarty discloses a system as stated above in Claim 1, wherein the connector (home interface terminal) comprises a set top terminal (Col. 5, Lines 24-27) with a memory (See Figure 8, 80). It is inherent in such a GUI-based system with on-screen text and icons (Col. 7, Lines 1-6) that data must be stored memory. Further disclosed is that the display comprises a television (See Figure 9, 38).

Regarding Claim 10, Hoarty discloses a system as stated above in Claim 1, wherein the head-end system transmits digital data using a modulated carrier (Col. 8, Lines 35-42) on an analog television channel. This reads on the claimed processor (head end computer) comprising an encoder.

Regarding Claims 11 and 12, Hoarty discloses a system as stated above in Claim 1, wherein the head-end broadcasts data over a cable TV system (Col. 8, Lines 43-46). This reads on the claimed transmitter module comprising a broadcast television transmitter.

Regarding Claim 13, Hoarty discloses a system as stated above in Claim 12, wherein the connector (home interface controller) is connected to the cable television

Art Unit: 2623

network (See Figure 9). This reads on the claimed connector comprising a cable connector. The connector receives interactive data on a dedicated television channel (Col. 13, Lines 1-25). This reads on the claimed extracting textual data from the video formatted composite signal (CATV signal).

Regarding Claim 18, see Claims 1 and 10 above.

Regarding Claim 19, see Claim 2 above.

Regarding Claim 22, Hoarty discloses a method as stated above in Claim 18, further comprising receiving an indication of a selected portion of the textual data identified by the menu and displaying the selected portion of the textual data (Col. 7, Lines 1-6).

Regarding Claim 23, see Claim 7 above.

Regarding Claim 24, Hoarty discloses a method as stated above in Claim 18, wherein the set top terminal receives a video signal from the CATV network (See Figure 3) as stated above. Further disclosed is that the set top terminal has a memory (See Figure 8, 80) for storage of selected textual data, as stated above. Also, the set top terminal uses a television (See Figure 3, 38) to display the menu, as stated above.

Art Unit: 2623

Regarding Claims 26 and 27, see Claims 10 and 11 above, respectively.

Regarding Claim 28, Hoarty discloses a method as stated above in Claim 19, wherein the head-end transmits the text data in an RF carrier using modulation (Col. 8, Lines 35-46) in a separate channel space between physical TV channels. This reads on the claimed sending textual data without any video. The textual data is received by a node, which then supplies the data via a dedicated full-bandwidth video channel to the user (Col. 13, Lines 1-10 and Lines 21-58). This reads on the claimed using the textual data to fill an entire channel of video, and using a cable television transmitter to send the textual data.

Regarding Claim 29, see Claim 13 above.

Regarding Claim 63, see Claim 1 above.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoarty et al. in view of Kubota in further view of Redford in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,210,611 to Yee et al.

Regarding Claim 3, Hoarty, Kubota and Redford disclose a system as stated above in Claim 1, but fail to teach that the processor produces the electronic signal as a signal to be transmitted over a telephone system.

Yee discloses a system for transmitting and receiving teletext (Col. 9, Lines 55-58) for use on a television (Col. 6, Lines 39-43). Yee further discloses that data may be transmitted over telephone lines and received at the user's terminal via a modem (Col.

Art Unit: 2623

9, Lines 63-67). Yee is evidence that ordinary workers in the art would appreciate the ability to use an electronic signal transmitted over a telephone signal in a television-based text transmission system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hoarty, Kubota and Redford, with the telephone transmission of data of Yee in order to allow users to receive data from other private sources as taught by Yee (Col. 9, Lines 63-67).

5. Claims 4-5, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoarty et al. in view of Kubota in further view of Redford in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,632,022 to Warren et al.

Regarding Claim 4, Hoarty, Kubota and Redford disclose a system as stated above in Claim 1, but fail to teach that the display displays an electronic representation of books on a bookshelf, related to the textual data.

Warren discloses a graphical user interface (Col. 6, Lines 19-22) that uses a bookshelf metaphor (See Figure 1, Col. 6, Lines 1-10 and 36-43) to browse and query (Col. 7, Lines 29-32) information. Warren is evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate the ability to represent data as books on a bookshelf.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hoarty, Kubota and Redford with the bookshelf metaphor of Warren in order to present users with an immediately familiar method of accessing data as disclosed by Warren (Col. 6, Lines 39-67).

Regarding Claim 5, Hoarty discloses a system as stated above in Claim 1. Further, Hoarty in view of Warren discloses a system as stated above in Claim 4. Warren further discloses formatting the menu according to category (See Figure 1 and Col. 7, Line 48-64).

Regarding Claims 20 and 21, see Claims 4 and 5 above, respectively.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoarty et al. in view of Kubota in further view of Redford in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,361,848 to Poignet et al.

Regarding Claim 6, Hoarty, Kubota and Redford disclose a system as stated above in Claim 1, wherein the set top comprises a microprocessor (See Figure 8, 80) that receives an indication of a selected portion of the textual data identified by the menu (Col. 10, Lines 10-14), and wherein the display displays the selected portion of the textual data (Col. 7, Lines 1-6), but fail to teach that the display comprises the microprocessor that receives the indication.

Poignet discloses a teletext system for broadcasting pages to a television receiver wherein the reception terminal may be integrated with the television receiver (Col. 4, Lines 51-60). This reads on the claimed display comprising a microprocessor.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hoarty, Kubota and Redford

Art Unit: 2623

with the set top integrating with the television of Poignet in order to reduce the cost and complexity of the user's systems as well as the required wiring/setup.

6. Claims 9, 14-17, 25 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoarty et al. in view of Kubota, in further view of Redford in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,475,399 to Borsuk.

Regarding Claim 9, Hoarty, Kubota and Redford disclose a system as stated above in Claim 1, but fail to teach that the display comprises a portable, hand-held viewer.

Borsuk discloses a hand-held portable reading unit (See Figure 1) that is connected to a computer and modem (See Figure 5 and Col. 6, Lines 1-20) for reading text (Col. 4, Lines 35-41 and Col. 5, Lines 57-67).

Borsuk is evidence that ordinary workers in the art would appreciate the ability to use a portable device to read textual data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hoarty and Kubota with the portable reader of Borsuk in order to allow a user to read content wherever or whenever they choose (Col. 1, Lines 23-29).

Regarding Claim 14, Hoarty, Kubota and Redford disclose a system as stated above in Claim 1. Hoarty in view of Borsuk further discloses a system as stated above in Claim 9. Borsuk further discloses a library unit, such as a computer (See Figure 5),

Art Unit: 2623

connected to a connector such as a modem (Col. 6, Lines 15-17), for processing textual data. The PC acts as a mass storage database (Col. 6, Lines 1-2) that receives data from remote locations as stated above. This reads on the claimed digital logic for screening textual data and a memory for storing the data. Further, a viewer (See Figure 1) interfaces with the library unit electronically (See Figure 5 and Col. 6, Lines 4-9), the viewer displaying the textual data as text (Col. 5, Lines 57-67).

Regarding Claim 15, Hoarty, Kubota and Redford in view of Borsuk disclose a system as stated above in Claim 14. Borsuk discloses that a PC (library unit) stores text files (Col. 6, Lines 15-17) for transmission to a portable reader as stated above. Further disclosed is that the PC contains a screen and a user interface, such as a keyboard (See Figure 5 and Col. 6, Line 10). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a computer with a display that stores text files locally would be able to display the stored text files with a viewer such as a text viewing program. This reads on the claimed library unit (computer) and viewer (viewing program) being contained within a common housing.

Regarding Claim 16, Hoarty, Kubota, Redford in view of Borsuk disclose a system as stated above in Claim 14. Borsuk further discloses that the portable viewer has a memory (See Figure 2, RAM 44) for storing text data (Col. 4, Lines 35-39) received from the library unit (Col. 6, Lines 1-9). Further disclosed is a microprocessor (40) connected to the second memory (See Figure 2) for controlling the functions of the

Art Unit: 2623

viewer. Also disclosed is a digital display circuit (50) for creating displays (Col. 4, Lines 15-18) and a liquid crystal display (Col. 3, Line 49) connected to the digital display circuitry (See Figure 2, 8) for displaying text.

Regarding Claim 17, Hoarty, Kubota and Redford in view of Borsuk disclose a system as stated above in Claim 14. Borsuk further discloses that the portable viewer comprises a storage media device insert port in which an EEPROM memory device is received (Col. 3, Lines 57-62). This reads on the claimed second memory comprising a removable electronic card memory.

Regarding Claim 25, see Claim 9 above.

Regarding Claims 30 and 31, see Claims 14 and 15 above, respectively.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2623

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason P. Salce whose telephone number is (571) 272-7301. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jason P Salce
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2623

December 27, 2006

